

S/N 10/667,560

Response to Office Action mailed July 13, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 6, and includes a Replacement Sheet.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

S/N 10/667,560  
Response to Office Action mailed July 13, 2005

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and reexamination of this application are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1, 7, and 11 are hereby amended. Claims 3, 4, 8, 13, and 14 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Amendment of claim 1 is supported by the subject matter of claim 4. Amendment of claim 7 is supported by the subject matter of claim 8. Amendment of claim 11 is supported by the subject matter of claim 14.

Figure 6 was objected to for not being labeled as "Prior Art". Figure 6 is amended to address the concerns of the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration of the drawings is requested.

Claims 1 and 11 were rejected as being anticipated by Pasturczak (US 2,708,920). Claims 1 and 11 include the subject matter of claims 4 and 14, respectively. The subject matter of claims 4 and 14 is not subjected to this rejection, therefore, the rejection is rendered moot. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to the rejected claims. Favorable reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1 and 11 are requested.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 11, and 12 were rejected as being anticipated by Koske (US 4,689,060). Claims 1, 7, and 11 include the subject matter of claims 4, 8, and 14, respectively. The subject matter of claims 4, 8, and 14 is not subjected to this rejection, therefore, the rejection is rendered moot. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to the rejected claims.

Further, Koske does not disclose an air cleaner device including an arrangement of a main air cleaner and a sub air cleaner in which an intake port of the main air cleaner opposes a communicating port that connects the main air cleaner with the sub air cleaner, as required by claims 1, 7, and 11. The claimed air cleaner device provides an exterior

S/N 10/667,560

Response to Office Action mailed July 13, 2005.


appearance free from air cleaner protrusions by reducing the amount that the air cleaners protrude in a width direction of the vehicle.

Since Koske does not teach or suggest all the air cleaner device elements and relationships thereof, required by claims 1, 7, and 11, the reference cannot be considered to anticipate the current invention. Favorable reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1, 2, 7, 11, and 12 are requested.

In view of the above, early issuance of a notice of allowance is solicited. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165, at (612)455-3802.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: October 13, 2005



Curtis B. Hamre

Reg. No.: 29,165

Hamre, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.

225 South Sixth Street

Suite 2650

Minneapolis, MN 55402

612.455.3800

CBH/mfe